

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment responds to the office action dated December 30, 2005.

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts. Claim 1 has been canceled.

The applicant has added new claims 2-9. Independent claim 2, from which dependent claims 3-9 respectively depend, includes the limitations of “a plurality of conductive traces supported by [a] membrane” and “a plurality of contacts supported by said membrane, each of said contacts connected to at least one of said conductive traces, each said contact having at least one substantially flat surface inclined at an acute angle relative to an axis perpendicular to said surface, and wherein each said contacts tilts in response to pressing engagement with said electrical device.” These limitations are not disclosed by the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 2-9.

Respectfully submitted,



Kurt Rohlfs
Reg. No. 54,405
Tel: (503) 227-5631